

KAREL H. MÁCHA'S PHILOSOPHICAL CHALLENGE TO THE CATHOLIC ENLIGHTENMENT IN BOHEMIA

Zdeněk V. David



Abstract: One of the channels through which Romantic mentality was intruding on the more traditional Czech sober-mindedness was through Polish literature, deeply saturated with Romanticism in the post-Napoleonic era. Romanticism, like philosophical Idealism, had a tendency toward an ontological dissolution of the individual, whether through a pantheistic embrace or through the organic interconnectedness of society – or even the world. The principal personage who served as a conduit of the full-blooded Romanticist thought into the Czech cultural scene was the famous Karel Hynek Mácha.

The highly negative criticism of Mácha's poetry and prose by the contemporary literary and intellectual establishment of Bohemia, particularly by Josef Kajetán Tyl, Čelakovský, Josef K. Chmelenský, Jan S. Tomiček and others, revealed the contrast between philosophical Idealism and the unitary metaphysics of Romanticism on the one hand, and the realism, empiricism and ontological individualism of the typical Bohemian world outlook stemming from the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment on the other. One can examine another, closely related, source of resentment against Mácha's literary style. It was the reflection of elements of the Baroque mentality (visionary, passionate and irrational), which had survived the intervention of the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment. Along these lines, parallels have been discerned between his work and the literature of the Counter Reformation era (particularly, the poetry of Fridrich Bridel).

Thus, it seems evident that Mácha's devotion to Polish-style Romanticism and harkening after the mystique of the Counter Reformation clashed with the Czech sobriety and realism of the Catholic Enlightenment, a legacy reinforced by the earlier tradition of the Utraquist mainstream of the Bohemian Reformation. What caused resentment in Bohemia assured Mácha a favorable reception in areas under the sway of German Romanticism and philosophical Idealism, especially in Poland and in Slovakia, and attests to the presence of two philosophical traditions in east-central Europe. Thus, the case of Mácha can also serve as a prism through which to distinguish the two cultures of east-central Europe in the early nineteenth century.

Keywords: Austro-Bohemian Catholic Enlightenment, Baroque scholasticism, Biedermeier, Counter Reformation, Idealism, German, Karel Hynek Mácha, Czech Romanticism, Polish Romanticism, Thomistic realism, Utraquism

The Bohemian aversion to Romanticism in belles lettres from the 1820s through the 1840s exploded in the adverse reaction to the writings of Karel Hynek Mácha by the contemporary literary and intellectual establishment of Bohemia, particularly by Josef Kajetán Tyl, František L. Čelakovský, Josef K. Chmelenský, and Jan S. Tomiček, as well as many others. This wave of criticism constituted one of the most notable and well known episodes on the Czech cultural scene of the second quarter of the nineteenth century. The nature of this campaign has been perceptively summed up in the following way: Mácha, disquietude, and Romanticism were thus rejected as an orientation that did not fit into the Czech culture, an orientation, which was adopted from abroad and which was a manifestation of sickness in the Czech milieu.¹

This article seeks to shed new light on the grand cultural clash by establishing a connection, which has not been noted previously, between the excoriation of Mácha on one hand, and the distinctive Bohemian weltanschauung, which emerged from the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment, on the other hand. The connection of the Realistic outlook

with the Josephist Enlightenment, however, was not merely accidental or casual, but deeply rooted in the Bohemian, as well as Austrian intellectual ambiance. As a salient feature, the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment had been B at its start under Empress Maria-Theresa (1740–1780) B philosophically grounded by a rejection of the essentialist Baroque scholasticism of the Counter Reformation in favor of the existentialism of Thomistic philosophy. The transition was effected by the architects of Josephist Reform Catholicism, who favored the realist Aquinas over the metaphysician Francisco Suárez. The other side of the coin, as far as the result of Theresa's intellectual revolution was concerned, was a deep aversion to Baroque emotionalism and mysticism, which the philosophy of the so-called second scholasticism represented in Suárez.²

Moreover, the anti-essentialist standpoint and ontic pluralism of the Josephist Enlightenment, as well as the aversion to the emotionalism and epistemological monism of the Counter Reformation, persisted in the Czech intellectual ambiance into the first half of nineteenth century under the paramount pedagogical influence of Bernard Bolzano

¹ Miloš Pohorský, *Mácha a Český romantismus v evropských souvislostech*, in Karel Hynek Mácha, *Dílo*, 2 vols., Miloš Pohorský, ed. (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1986), 2: 390–391.

² Zdeněk V. David, *Hegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia*, *Kosmas*, 18, no. 2 (2005), 17–20.

(1781–1848) and Franz Exner (1802–1853).³ In addition, as far as Bohemia was concerned, the philosophy of the Josephist Enlightenment harmonized with the realism of the Golden Age of the sixteenth century. As I have explored elsewhere, this Czech historical legacy was recovered in the early stage of the National Awakening and its effect reinforced the impact of the Enlightenment.⁴ I argue that the Mácha phenomenon powerfully challenged the established Czech cultural outlook in two ways. Mainly, the resentment against Mácha's intellectual orientation revealed the contrast between, on the one hand, philosophical Idealism and the monistic metaphysics of Romanticism, and on the other hand the realism, empiricism and ontic individualism stemming from the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment. In the second place, the resentment against Mácha's literary style stemmed from its embracing elements of the Baroque mentality (visionary, passionate and irrational), which clashed with the sobriety, calmness and rationalism that also derived from the spirit of the Josephist Enlightenment. Paradoxically, the two tendencies followed opposite directions. One, which may be called Ainnovative aimed beyond the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment to the Lutheran-inspired German Romanticism and Idealism. The other, which might be called Aretrospective, aimed at the Baroque culture of the Counter Reformation, which the Catholic Josephist Enlightenment sought to supercede. Incidentally, the Aretrospective tendency also mirrored the clash between two versions of Catholicism, the Josephist liberal, and the Tridentine of the Counter Reformation.

This assessment of Mácha's Romantic Idealism also helps to illuminate anew the intellectual differentiation within east central Europe. It highlights the significance of the fact that, unlike in Bohemia, Mácha's work was favorably received and emulated in Slovakia and Poland. It can be argued that this positive reaction parallels the vogue of Herder's social philosophy and Hegel's Idealism in the Slovak and the Polish intellectual ambiance, which had remained

unaffected by the Austro-Bohemian Catholic Enlightenment or its equivalent. What passed for Catholic Enlightenment in Poland lacked the pronounced Anti-Tridentine tenor, the tendency toward papal minimalism, and the anti-monasticism in general and anti-Jesuitism in particular, which were characteristic of Josephist Reform Catholicism.⁵ Moreover, the Poles were exposed to powerful intellectual influences in the Grand Duchy and the Poznań area respectively from Russia and Prussia, where philosophical Idealism flourished.⁶

Slovak Lutheran intellectuals, who were the leaders of the Slovak national awakening, imbibed Herderian Romanticism and Hegelian Idealism during their traditional studies at German Protestant universities.⁷ In this respect, it is significant that close parallels exist between the poetry of Mácha and Jan Kollár.⁸ This significance has been obscured by considering Kollár a full-fledged participant in the Czech cultural ambiance. Actually, Kollár, although writing in Czech, was not formed by the realism and sobriety of the Josephist Catholic Enlightenment like the Czech intellectuals, but by the Romanticism and Idealism stemming from German Lutheran universities, like his Slovak Protestant compatriots L'udevít Štúr, Michal M. Hodža, and Josef M. Hurban.⁹ Hegel's influence also facilitated the reception of Polish Romanticism by Slovak intellectuals.¹⁰

An Insertion of the Other Culture

At first sight, it might appear paradoxical that Mácha should combine influences of Romanticism, arising from German Protestant Lutheran milieu, with those of the Counter Reformation, stemming from Spanish scholastic tradition. This paradox, therefore, requires an explanation. Actually, there was not merely a formal, but also a causal kinship between Baroque or late scholasticism with its Aessentialism, on the one hand, and German metaphysical Idealism on the other. While molding Tridentine Catholic schooling, late scholasticism also exerted an influence in the Protestant world

³ Zdeněk V. David, *Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening: Legacies of the Bohemian Reformation* (Washington, D.C.: Wilson Center Press; and Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), chapter 11. On the issue of Catholic Enlightenment see David Sorokin, *Reform Catholicism and Religious Enlightenment*, *Austrian History Yearbook*, 30 (1999), 187–219, and Comments by T. C. W. Blanning and R. J. W. Evans, *ibid.*, 221–235; T. C. W. Blanning, *The Enlightenment in Catholic Germany*, in Roy Porter and Teich, eds., *The Enlightenment in National Context* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 118–126.

⁴ On the relationship between the sixteenth-century literature of the Bohemian Reformation era on one hand, and the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment on the other, see Zdeněk V. David, *Národní obrození jako převtělení Zlatého věku*, *Český časopis historický*, 99 (2001), 486–518. On the contrast between the Josephist Enlightenment and Baroque culture see also Robert B. Pynsent, *Doslov*, in *idem*, *Ďáblové, ženy a národ: Výbor z úvah o české literatuře* (Prague: Karolinum, 2008), 575, 577.

⁵ The Catholic Enlightenment Polish-style seemed to involve more a social rather than ecclesiastical reform; see Jerzy Kloczowski, *History of Polish Christianity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 173–190. See also Maciej Janowski, *Polish Liberal Thought up to 1918*, transl. Danuta Przekop (Budapest: Central European University Press, c2002).

⁶ Andrzej Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 142–145, 173–176; *Historia Polski, 1831–1864*, eds. Stefan Kieniewicz and Witold Kula, vol. 2, part 3 of *Historia Polski*, ed. Tadeusz Manteuffel, 4 vols. (Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe, 1957– [1984]), 418–421. For the Russians, German Idealism, especially that of Hegel, dovetailed with the philosophical maximalism of the Eastern Orthodox Church; Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Slovanské studie: Slavjanofilství Ivana Vasiljeviče Kirejevského*, in Masaryk, *Slovanské studie a texty z let 1889–1891*, *Spisy* 20 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2007), 96. Prussia was the largely unchallenged domain of Hegel's philosophy.

⁷ Elena Várossová, *Hegelovské inšpirácie u Štúra a Hurbana*, in Várossová, *Filozofia vo svete: svet filozofie u nás* (Bratislava: Veda, 2005), 162; Karol Kuzmány, *Ladislav, Hronka*, 3, (1838), 153–154; Ján Ďurovič, *Slovenský pietizmus*, *Historica Slovaca*, 3–4 (1945–1946), 197; Robert B. Pynsent, *Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1994), 73.

⁸ Pohorský, *Mácha a český romantismus v evropských souvislostech*, 2:381; Felix Vodička, *Cesty a cíle obrozené literatury* (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1958), 155–163; Robert Sak, *Josef Jungmann: Život obrozenec* (Prague: Vyšehrad, 2007), 15, 104. On Mácha's admiration for Kollár, see Čapek, Jan B., *Návrat básníkův, Naše Doba*, 46 (1939), 398.

⁹ David, *Hegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia*, 16–17; Cyril Kraus, *Na tému Karel H. Mácha a Slováci*, *Romboid* (Bratislava), 22 (1987), pt. 5, 68.

¹⁰ Kuzmány, *Ladislav*, 58–61.

in the early modern period. Christian Wolff, in particular, highly valued Suárez, and even Hegel spoke of him with approval. It has been, in fact, suggested that Hegel became one of the legatees of Suárez's anti-realism and anti-individualism.¹¹ By the late sixteenth century the representatives of late scholasticism, like Pedro Fonseca, Benito Pereira and Suárez, had become standard references in the German Protestant universities.¹²

The principal intermediary between the metaphysics of Spanish late scholasticism and that of German Idealism was Wolff, whose notion of being was basically the same as that of Suárez whom he had not only read, but analyzed, and whom he proclaimed as the deepest among Scholastic metaphysicians.¹³ This led to a counterintuitive Ibero-Jesuit and Luthero-Teutonic philosophical and theological cross-fertilization, which sheds light on Mácha's mentality.¹⁴ From Wolff, the essentialist philosophy entered the world of German Idealism through Kant, who considered the pedestrian Wolff the ultimate metaphysician, and B curiously B a philosopher superior to Spinoza, Leibniz, or Descartes.¹⁵ As a further link in this chain of relationship, it was not surprising that the late representatives of Suárezian scholasticism would, in turn, find Wolff's metaphysics congenial.¹⁶

Monistic Idealism: the Polish Romanticism

If the Mácha phenomenon is viewed as a clash between two cultures, the external, essentialist one, which through Mácha clashed with the realistic attitude of the Bohemian Enlightenment, emanated largely from Polish Romanticism. The main trigger for the intrusion of this external culture was

the failure of the Polish Uprising of 1830–1831.¹⁷ Although Mácha from a young age was an avid reader of Polish poetry, especially that of Adam Mickiewicz, he fully imbibed the Romantic mentality of the Polish exiles who had found refuge in Prague after the unsuccessful Polish Uprising.¹⁸ He then took copious notes on the writings of Polish Romantics: Antoni Młczyński (1793–1826); the Hegelian philosopher and poet Stefan Garczyński (1805–1833); Julian Korsak (1807–1855); Seweryn Goszczyński (1801–1876); Józef Zaleski (1802–1886) and others.¹⁹ In addition to those above, Mácha cites the poetry of Augustyn Bielowski, Józef Dunin-Borkowski, Ludwik Jabłonowski, D. G. Magnuszewski, Juljan Niemcewicz, Lucjan Siemieński, Alojzy Skarzyński, Juljusz Słowacki, and Kazimierz W. Wójcicki in his novel *Cikáni* [Gypsies].²⁰

Russian literature, which also could have supplied the Romantic inspiration linked with the metaphysics of German idealism, had a less significant impact on Mácha. The poet was aware of the leading lights of Russian Romanticism of the 1820s and early 1830s. His *Notebooks* refer above all to Aleksandr Pushkin,²¹ but also to Vasilii A. Zhukovskii (1783–1852), to the poem Voinarovskii by Kondratii F. Ryleev (1795–1826), and to Anton A. Del'vig (1798–1831).²² Yet Polish literature decisively predominated in Mácha's *Notebooks*, which is in large part explicable by the proximity of the Polish area to Bohemia. Part of the former, namely Galicia, was in fact included within the Habsburg Monarchy (since 1773). For Mácha an important source for Polish intellectual life and literature was the journal *Haliczanin*, published by Walenty Chłędowski, and Augustyn

¹¹ Copleston, *History of Philosophy*, 3:379. For Wolff's dependence on Suárez see Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 113.

¹² Ernst Lewalter, *Spanisch-jesuitische und deutsch-lutherische Metaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der iberisch-deutschen Kulturbeziehungen und zur Vorgeschichte des deutschen Idealismus* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), 7–11, 58–59, 76; *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 621, 629; Karl Eschweiler, *ADie Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik an den deutschen Universitäten des 17. Jahrhunderts, Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft*, 1 (1928), 289–302. The reason for the Protestant preference for Baroque over Medieval scholasticism has been seen in part in the appeal of the former's systematic presentation of metaphysics, moreover couched in an impeccable Humanistic Latin. The Iberians' Latin surpassed the barbaric Latin of the High Middle Ages; and Suárez had the most excellent systematic presentation of metaphysics, available anywhere, while in Thomas [Aquinas] a systematic overall presentation is missing. De Vries, *Zur Geschichte und Problematik der Barockscholastik*, 1–2.

¹³ Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 118.

¹⁴ Eschweiler, *Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik*, 251–325.

¹⁵ Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 120; De Vries, *Zur Geschichte und Problematik der Barockscholastik*, 5; Lewalter, *Spanisch-jesuitische und deutsch-lutherische Metaphysik*, 14. See also Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Protestantská školská metafysika a její význam pro německý idealismus, Filosofický časopis*, 42 (1984), 50–56.

¹⁶ Jansen, *Philosophen katholischen Bekenntnisses*, 12, 16, 28, 40–41, 50. The last Jesuit in charge philosophical studies at the University of Prague, appointed in 1752, the astronomer Joseph Stepling (1716–1778), advocated the use of Wolff, whose textbook had been approved by the Inquisition censorship in Verona. In 1758, he contrasted Wolff with philosophers, such as Hobbes, Spinoza and Locke, who were suspected of deism, if not atheism; Marie Pavlíková, *Bolzanovo působení na pražské univerzitě* (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1985), 16; Eduard Winter, *Der Josefismus: die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus, 1740–1848* (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1962), 63–65.

¹⁷ Josef Peřina, *K problematice ohlasů polského povstání v tvorbě Karla H. Máchy z let 1830–1832, Česko-polské rozhovory*, 1993 (Ústí nad Labem: Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně, 1994), 21, 24.

¹⁸ Alexandr Stich, "Ještě k Máchovi: Velký a silný protivník J. K. Tyl," in František Černý, ed., *Monology o Josefu Kajetánu Tylovi* (Prague: Karolinum, 1993), 66.

¹⁹ Marian Szykowski, *Karol Hynek Mácha, tvůrca českého romantizmu* ([Lodz] "Czytelnik", 1948), 13–18; idem, *Polski romantyzm w czeskim zyciu duchowym* (Poznań: Instytut Zachodni, 1947).

²⁰ In the mottos preceding individual chapters, see Karel Hynek Mácha, *Próza*, Spisy 2, eds. Karel Jánský and others (Prague: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, 1961), 165, 174, 184, 193, 200, 211, 217, 225, 230, 243, 249, 262, 269. In his *Zapísník* [Notebook], Mácha refers again, mainly under his reading for 1834, to Bielowski, Dunin-Borkowski, Goszczyński, Jabłonowski, Korsak, Magnuszewski, Mickiewicz, Niemcewicz, Siemieński, Skarzyński, and Wójcicki; see Karel Hynek Mácha, *Literární zápísníky, Deníky, Dopisy*, Spisy 3, eds. Karel Jánský and others (Prague: Odeon, 1972), 194–200, 211. Elsewhere in his *Zapísník*, he lists newly Kazimierz Brodziński and Alexandr Chodźko, *ibid.*, 135, 212.

²¹ He refers to Pushkin's *Poltava*, Evgenii Onegin, Ruslan and Liudmila, Boris Godunov, Gypsies, Prisoner from Caucasus, Fountain of Bakhchisarai; Mácha, *Literární zápísníky, Deníky, Dopisy*, 33, 48.

²² Mácha, *Literární zápísníky*, 33, 135, 432.

Bielowski's almanac *Ziewonja*, both appearing in L'viv in the early 1830s.²³ In addition, much Polish literature was brought to Prague in 1830–1831 by Polish exiles escaping Russia's rule.²⁴

The influence of Polish literature and philosophy on Mácha's writing by far exceeded in significance that of Byron's poetry.²⁵ The overwhelming Polish impact is graphically suggested by Mácha's citation of even Byron's poetry in a Polish translation by Korsak.²⁶ Mácha's *Notebooks*, however, do indicate an interest in, and a substantial knowledge of, Byron's writings, albeit in Polish or German translations.²⁷ Aside from Byron, the most frequent references from the realm of Anglophone literature in Mácha's *Notebooks* are to Walter Scott.²⁸

As for other sources linked with Romanticism and contradicting the Realistic tenor of the Austro-Bohemian Catholic Enlightenment, František F. Šalda saw Mácha embracing mystical Christian Platonism.²⁹ Chyževs'kyi uncovered Mácha's use of symbols from occult philosophies which had significant input into the intellectual genesis of Romanticism, such as the theosophy of Jacob Boehme and the Rosicrucians.³⁰ In Mácha's early notebook there are references to Herder B the paragon of Slovak Romanticism.³¹ Most significantly, he endorses the concept of language as the highest ontological value in national life, which Herder

developed in his *Briefen zur Beförderung der Humanität* [Letters for the Advancement of Humanity].³²

There are also indications of Mácha's venturing beyond Romanticism into the world of German Idealism. He was exposed to the teaching of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, while studying at the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Prague (1830–1832) and showed great interest in the philosophical systems, when student of Professor Johann Peithner Lichtenfels.³³ He was interested specifically in the discussion of pantheism and the lack of personal immortality, which arose in German Hegelian circles around the book of Friedrich Richter, *Die neue Unsterblichkeitslehre* (Breslau, 1833).³⁴ For Pavera, Mácha's idea of nothingness at the start and at the end of worldly existence, reflected a likely influence of Hegel's metaphysics.³⁵ As evident from his notebooks, Mácha's reading included *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, published by Hegel's students in Berlin in 1834, and philosophical articles in Chłędowski's journal, *Haliczanin*.³⁶ Contemporary Czech critics, like Tomíček, related Mácha's philosophical nihilism to the influence of Hegel and other Idealist philosophers who denied the ontic existence of the individual. As a consequence, according to Tomíček, Mácha's literary hero of *Máj*, deprived of his identity, was eventually thrust into an undifferentiated ocean A without any shape, without any purpose.³⁷ Echoes

²³ Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 211, 443; Mácha, *Próza*, 381–382, . See also Mácha, *Dílo*, 2:363. Although Mácha drew also on editions of Polish literature in western Europe.

²⁴ See Mácha's letter to Eduard Hindl from the early 1830s; Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 303.

²⁵ René Wellek, for instance, rejects any deep or systematic influence of Byron's poetry on Mácha; see René Wellek, The Two Traditions of Czech Literature, in idem, *Essays on Czech Literature*, intro. Peter Demetz (Hague: Mouton, 1963), 27; 167–178; and an earlier version, Wellek, K. H. Mácha a anglická literatura, in Jan Mukařovský, ed., *Torso a tajemství Máchova díla*, 388–401. See also Pohorský, Mácha je Mácha, in Mácha, *Dílo*, 1:417–418; idem, Mácha a český romantismus v evropských souvislostech, in *ibid.*, 2:379; Jan Mukařovský, *Příklad poezie: K otázce trvalé platnosti Máchova díla* (Prague: Pražská imaginace, 1991), 41; Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, K Máchovu světovému názoru, in Jan Mukařovský, ed., *Torso a tajemství Máchova díla*, Sborník pojednání Pražského lingvistického kroužku (Prague: Borový, 1938), 114. Jan Mukařovský, ed., *Dějiny české literatury*. 4 vols. (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1959–1995), 2:435.

²⁶ Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 173. According to Dmytro Chyževs'kyi, the image of a lonely individual humbly exploring the depths of his own soul was not typical of Romantic Byronism, nor was the hero's resignation B instead of an aristocratic hubris – in the face of adversity; Čyževs'kyj, K Máchovu světovému názoru, 123–124.

²⁷ For instance, Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 35–36, 65, 67, 82, 90–91, 124. In particular, he was aware of a collected edition of Byron's works in twelve volumes, published in Frankfurt under the editorship of Dr. Adrian in the early 1830s. *Ibid.*, 78.

²⁸ See, Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 20–21, 26, 65, 78, 84, 112–118, 259. There are also numerous references to Shakespeare (*ibid.*, 16, 22, 65, 125, 127, 130, 288), and Edward Bulwer-Lytton, (*ibid.*, 220, 240, 284–285, 296, 322, 327), and individual ones to Milton (*ibid.*, 65–66), Washington Irving (*ibid.*, 91–95), and Laurence Sterne (*ibid.*, 65), as well as to John Jewel's *An Apologie, or Answer in Defense of the Church of England* (1562) in a Czech translation, published in 1619; *ibid.*, 174–175.

²⁹ František X. Šalda, Karel Hynek Mácha a jeho dědictví, in Šalda, *Duše a dílo: podobizny a medailony*, Soubor díla 2 (Prague: Melantrich, 1950), 37.

³⁰ Čyževs'kyj, K Máchovu světovému názoru, 111–180.

³¹ Mácha, *Próza*, 129; Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 50.

³² In ihr [die Sprache] wohnt sein ganzer Gedankenreichtum an Tradition, Geschichte, Religion und Grundsätzen des Lebens, all sein Herz und Seele. Einem solchen Volk seine Sprache nehmen, heisst ihm ein einziges, unsterbliches Eigentum nehmen, das von Eltern an Kinder fortgeht. Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 15. See also quotes concerning Comenius, *ibid.* 13–14. Libor Pavera, Romantismus a předchozí literární tradice zvláště barokní, in Libor, *Od středověku k romantismu: úvahy o starší literatuře* (Opava: Slezská univerzita, 2000), 192.

³³ Mukařovský, ed., *Dějiny české literatury*, 2:432–33, 434.

³⁴ Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 217; see also 447–448, and Karel Janský, *Karel Hynek Mácha: život uchvatitele krásy* (Prague: Melantrich, 1953), 258–259.

³⁵ According to Pavera, Mácha might have studied Hegel directly, or more probably learned his ideas from the Polish poet Stefan Garczyński. See Pavera, Romantismus a předchozí literární tradice zvláště barokní, 191.

³⁶ Concerning Hegel's alleged influence on Mácha, see František Fajfr, "Hegel bei den Čechen," in Dmytro Chyževs'kyi, ed., *Hegel bei den Slaven* (Reichenberg: Stiepel, 1934), 437. Karel Sabina also testified about Mácha's avid interest in metaphysics. Chyževs'kyi, K Máchovu světovému názoru, 112–114; Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 211. Concerning his interest in German pantheism and mysticism, as well as Hegelianism, see also *Slovník českých filozofů*, ed., Jiří Gabriel (Brno: Masarykova Univerzita, 1998), 356.

of Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Representation* have been detected in Mácha's poetry, including the masterpiece *Máj*.³⁸

Echoes of the Counter Reformation

While the sources of Mácha's Romanticism are fairly clear, it is essential for the central thesis of this article to call attention to Mácha's more obscure links with the Baroque mentality that are evident in his writings. There is a definite sense that the dark emotionalism and pessimism of his Romanticism reflect the Baroque gloominess and irrationality of the Counter Reformation, which the sunny optimistic and rational tenor of the Josephist Enlightenment had sought to exorcise.³⁹ For Mácha, there was an insuperable contrast between the spiritual and the physical.⁴⁰ The element of Adreaminess [*Schwärmerei*] as a source of human motivation, noted as a strong presence in Mácha's weltanschauung,⁴¹ has been also interpreted as a reprise of the Baroque dreaminess that the Enlightenment had also challenged. Mácha's Romantic version of the *Schwärmerei* was for Tyl, Mácha's main critic, a way to escape from the real and objective questions of life into an isolationist and debilitating preoccupation with the self. According to Tyl, it was a counsel of passivity that was alien to the Bohemian mind.⁴²

Among later commentators, Šalda concluded that Mácha, particularly in his prose, transformed the residual Baroque elements into full-fledged Romanticism.⁴³ Wellek estimated Mácha's pedigree thus: Although it is not possible to establish a real historical connection, Mácha's spiritual ancestors are rather among the Baroque poets than among the Romanticists of his own time.⁴⁴ Zdeněk Rotrekl claimed that, to some extent, Mácha's work reflected the spirit of the irrational, characteristic of the Baroque, and a willingness to leap into an abyss of the unknown.⁴⁵ Milada Součková

speaks of Aa pattern of Baroque morbidity in Mácha's poetry.⁴⁶ Jan Mukařovský saw in Mácha's Romanticism echoes of a secularized Baroque mysticism, as well as of Baroque imagination and emotionalism. He maintained that Mácha's relation to the Baroque was important for two reasons: first, for understanding him as a part of a tradition, not just an aberration; second, for understanding his poetic images and, in fact, the main ideas behind his work that operated through symbols with multiple meanings.⁴⁷ The authoritative *fin-de-siècle* compendium on Czech literary history, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* [*Czech Literature from the Beginnings to the Present*] (1998), has stated that Mácha: A...received a powerful inspiration from the Baroque culture (although earlier rejected by the Enlighteners, nevertheless still alive in the common subconscious).⁴⁸

Aside from these general observations, other literary historians uncovered more specific traces of the Baroque in Mácha's poetry and prose. Josef Vašica, in addition to observing the formal similarity between the penchant for paradoxical expression in Mácha and the Bohemian Baroque poets, drew attention to the similarity between Mácha's treatment of the figure of St. Ivan in his early poetical experimentation, and the legend of the same saint written by the leading Baroque poet of Bohemia, Fridrich Bridel (1619–1680).⁴⁹ Parallels, between Mácha's *Máj* and Bridel's *Co Bůh, co člověk* are particularly conspicuous in juxtaposing images of beauty and ugliness.⁵⁰ Chyzhevskiy cites parallels to Mácha's poetry from Polish, German, Spanish, and Czech Baroque literature⁵¹ and, in addition, he noted that the symbolism of occult philosophies (such as Boehme and the Rosicrucians, whose influence he detects in Mácha) dovetails with that of the Baroque. He further suggests that Mácha became acquainted with Baroque poetry and mysticism, thanks to the revival of these genres in German and Polish Romantic literature, with which he was familiar.⁵² Mácha, in fact,

³⁷ A...do okeánu letí beze všeho tvaru, beze všeho cíle. Jan Slavomír Tomiček, *Máj*, báseň od Karla Hynka Máchy, in Karel Hynek Mácha, *Dílo*, Vol. 1: *Básně, dramatické zlomky*, ed. Karel Janský (Prague: Fr. Borový, 1948), 428; Pohorský, *AMácha a český romantismus v evropských souvislostech*, 2:389. See also Henri Granjard, *Mácha et la renaissance nationale en Bohême* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves de l'Université de Paris, 1957), 21–22. The degree of Mácha's familiarity with Hegel's philosophy is uncertain; Schamschula, *Geschichte der tschechischen Literatur*, 2:21.

³⁸ Mácha, *Literární zápisky*, 220, 449–450.

³⁹ It is safe to assume that Mácha drew on elements of the Baroque mentality of the Counter Reformation which had survived the intervention of the Bohemian Enlightenment; see Granjard, *Mácha et la renaissance nationale en Bohême*, 36, 38; Jan Lehár, Alexandr Stich, Jaroslava Janáčková, and Jiří Holý, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* (Prague: Lidové noviny, 1998), 214; . See also V. Černý, *Baroko a romantismus*, *Kritický měsíčník*, (1938), 105.

⁴⁰ See Karel Janský and Vojtěch Jirátko, *Tajemství Křivokladu a jiné máchovské studie* (Prague: V. Petr, 1941), 34.

⁴¹ Vladimír Macura, *Český sen* (Prague: Lidové noviny, 1999), 41.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 36.

⁴³ Přehodnotit toto barokní residuum v expresionismus nebo v zenitismus romantický, byl, historicky vyvojně mluveno, vlastní stylový čin Máchův. See František X. Šalda, *AO krásné próze Máchově*, in Mukařovský, ed., *Torso a tajemství Máchova díla*, 183; also idem, Karel Hynek Mácha a jeho dědictví, 36. On traces of the Counter Reformation in Mácha's work, see also Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914–1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 438.

⁴⁴ Wellek, *The Two Traditions of Czech Literature*, 27.

⁴⁵ Zdeněk Rotrekl, *Barokní fenomén v současnosti* (Prague: Torst, 1995), 116–125.

⁴⁶ Milada Součková, *Czech Romantics* (The Hague: Mouton, 1958), 55.

⁴⁷ Mukařovský, *Příklad poezie: K otázce trvalé platnosti Máchova díla*, 40, 43. Moreover, Mukařovský suggested that, although Mácha had early lost his fervent religious faith, he retained echoes of its penchant for symbolism. *Ibid.*, 45.

⁴⁸ Lehár, Stich, Janáčková, and Holý, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku*, 214. See also Václav Černý, *Baroko a romantismus*, *Kritický měsíčník*, 1 (1938), 106–107.

⁴⁹ Josef Vašica, *České literární baroko* (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1938), 3, 66.

⁵⁰ Karel Hynek Mácha, *Básně a dramatické zlomky*, Spisy 1, ed. Karel Janský. (Prague: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, 1959), 45; Fridrich Bridel, *Básnické dílo*, ed. Milan Kopecký (Prague: Torst, 1994), 7.

⁵¹ Chyzhevskiy, *K Máchovu světovému názoru*, 125–134.

refers to Boehme by name in his notebook.⁵³ Subsequently, Antonín Měšťan pointed out that Mácha had a background not only in current, but also older literature, particularly from the Baroque period.⁵⁴ Hrdlička identifies three of Mácha's Amystical poems, in which man fuses with light, as more Baroque than Romantic.⁵⁵ More generally, Polish literary historians have also perceived parallels between Baroque and Romanticist literature.⁵⁶

Recently, the question of Mácha's dependence on the Baroque was addressed more systematically by Libor Pavera and Robert B. Pynsent. According to Pavera, heroes of Mácha's poetry and prose did not indulge in wallowing in the *Weltschmerz* of contemporary Romanticism, but rather, like the pilgrims of Baroque literature, they sought answer to the vanity of this life in another higher world.⁵⁷ Like Baroque poets such as Bridel, Mácha pictured the transient character of the world with epithets: Appearance, Adream, Avapor, and Afoam.⁵⁸ Mácha parted company with the Baroque writers, according to Pavera, because of his disbelief in the existence of a real permanent world. For Pavera, as we saw, his idea of nothingness at the start and at the end of worldly existence, reflected a likely influence of Hegel.⁵⁹ Finally, Pavera calls attention to Mácha's frequent use of stark contrasts and mystical symbols, reminiscent of Counter Reformation authors of the so-called Silesian school, such as Johannes Scheffler (AKA Angelus Silesius, 1624–1677) and Christian Hoffmann von Hoffmannswaldau (1616–1679).⁶⁰

Robert B. Pynsent sees the Baroque tradition reflected in Mácha's linking of sexual contact and death. He points out that Jarmila, the heroine of *Máj*, is presented as a symbol of both love and suicide.⁶¹ More generally concerning the sex-death relationship in *Máj*, Pynsent notes: A one of the characters is murdered, another commits suicide and a third one is executed B and all this because of love.⁶² Moreover,

in his discussion of the Baroque character of Mácha's poetry Pynsent draws on the vocabulary and imagery of Bohemian Jesuit prayer books, disseminated under the title of *Nebeklič* [Key to Heaven] since the onset of the Counter Reformation. This devotional literature was still commonly used in Czech households in the beginning of the nineteenth century, during Mácha's childhood and early youth.⁶³ In his analysis of the prayer books' contents, Pynsent calls attention to the frequent presence of Baroque literary topoi in Mácha's *Máj*, such as the reiterated contrast between Athe temporal and Athe eternal, the theme of incest (fatal to the three main heroes of *Máj*), various themes of femininity attributed to the Virgin (white tower, morning star, gate of heaven), the image of fatherland [*vlast, patria*] as the ultimate aim of life, and the linking of the concepts of Agoal and end.⁶⁴ Besides *Nebeklič* another example of belated penetration of Baroque poetry was the hymnal of Heřman A. Gallaš, *Múza moravská*, (Brno, 1813). Zuzana Urválková points out the similarity between its Baroque spirituality and Athe subjectively Romantic poetry of Mácha.⁶⁵

Biedermeier and the Catholic Enlightenment

The full significance of Mácha's revolt against the embedded Realism of Czech culture, which stemmed from the heritage of the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment, has been obscured and trivialized in literary history by attempts to integrate his work into the fabric of Czech literature and cultural outlook. These efforts to construct a tradition of Czech Romanticism attributed Romantic traits to such stalwarts of early nineteenth-century Czech literature as Tyl, Karel Havlíček, František Rubeš, Božena Němcová, and Karel J. Erben. It was appealing to distinguish the later generations of the Awakeners from the earlier ones, who were viewed as either lukewarm or outright opposed to the language revival due to their adherence to the cosmopolitan and ahistorical

⁵² *Ibid.*, 170. See also Ihor Mel'nychenko, >Daleka put' moia, ta marnyi poklyk...> *Tvorchist' Karla Hinka Makhy v konteksti ches'koho I evropejs'koho romantyzmu 20–40-kh rr. XIX st.* (Kiev: Stylos, 2003), 140.

⁵³ Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 217.

⁵⁴ Antonín Měšťan, *Geschichte der tschechischen Literatur im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1984), 83.

⁵⁵ The three poems are *Těžkomyslnost*, *Měsíc stojí*, and *V svět jsem vstoupil*; see Josef Hrdlička, *Obrazy světa v české literatuře: studie o způsobech celku* (Prague: Malvern, 2008), 53.

⁵⁶ Julian Krzyżanowski, *Od średniowiecza do baroku. Studia naukowo-literackie* (Warsaw: Roj, 1938), 7–53, cited by Pavera, *ARomantismus a předchozí literární tradice zvláště barokní*, 194.

⁵⁷ Pavera, *Romantismus a předchozí literární tradice zvláště barokní*, 189.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 190.

⁵⁹ See note 35 above. See also Hrdlička, *Obrazy světa v české literatuře*, 107, n. 126.

⁶⁰ Pavera, *Romantismus a předchozí literární tradice zvláště barokní*, 192.

⁶¹ Robert B. Pynsent, *Charakterizace v Máchově Máji*, in idem, *Ďáblové, ženy a národ*, 118. See also Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 309.

⁶² Robert B. Pynsent, *Touha, frustrace a trocha uspokojení: komentář k Hlaváčkově Mstivě kantiléně*, in idem, *Ďáblové, ženy a národ*, 266. For parallels between love and death in *Máj*, see Mácha, *Básně a dramatické zlomky*, 49. For Mácha, sexual love was a barrier to the attainment of spirituality; see Karel Janský and Vojtěch Jirá, *Tajemství Křivokladu a jiné máchovské studie* (Prague: V. Petr, 1941), 34.

⁶³ According to Josef Vašica, the prototype was composed by Martin of Kochem in German and translated into Czech by Edilbert Petr Nymburský (+1705); see Vašica, *České literární baroko*, 162, 309–310. Pynsent relies on *Poloviční Nebe-Klič* (N. p., n.d.[c. 1800]), having used three other editions; Pynsent, *Doslov*, in idem, *Ďáblové, ženy a národ*, 575, 577. Mácha was also familiar with *Kronika česká* of Václav Hájek of Libočany, a favorite literary source during the Counter Reformation, Mácha, *Literární zápisníky*, 9, 390. On the religious piety of Mácha's parents, see Janský, *Karel Hynek Mácha*, 24.

⁶⁴ Pynsent, *Doslov*, 577–79. Pynsent suggests that Czech literary historians in the late nineteenth and twentieth century tended to confuse this mystical fatherland of the Baroque with earthly Bohemia in order to portray Mácha as a nationalist.

⁶⁵ She cites an illustrative passage: *Skal vysokých pahrbkové/ vzhůru strmějí./ na nich strašní hrbolové/ semtam visejí./ jichžto hřbet kryjou křoviny/ neb svalené roztržiny.* Zuzanna Urválková, *Mezi barokem a biedermeierem. K povaze biedermeieru v Múze moravské (1813) Heřmana Agapita Gallaše, Biedermeier v českých zemích*, eds. Helena Lorenzová and Taťána Petrasová (Prague: KLP, 2004), 285–286, citing Heřman Agapit Gallaš, *Múza moravská*, new ed. Jiří Skalička (Olomouc, 2000), 176.

Enlightenment.⁶⁶ Thus, the label of Romanticism was readily applied to those Awakeners who lived past the heydays of the Josephist Enlightenment and who favored the revival of the Czech language, particularly Jungmann and his cohorts.⁶⁷ Accordingly, Jungmann was recently described as one who pioneered a Romantic divinization of the nation.⁶⁸

There were more subtle challenges to the view of Czech literature as primarily Realistic until the appearance of Máchá. Initially, the literary period (preceding Máchá) was designated as Classicism which, in fact, implied an extension of the Realist tenor deriving from the Josephist Enlightenment.⁶⁹ This characterization, however, was subsequently blunted by an application of the concept of Pre-Romanticism to the literary production of the generation of Jungmann, and by opposing this label to the earlier, and more appropriate one of Classicism. This happened despite Mukařovský's deploring in 1936 the confusion between Classicism and Romanticism in classifying Czech writers from Jungmann to Erben.⁷⁰

Finally, after almost two hundred years of vacillation, a consensus has emerged at the start of the twenty-first century with a recognition that the Realistic anti-Romanticist tenor of literature persisted in Bohemia during 1820 to 1845. It was then epitomized in literature by the writings of Tyl, Havlíček, Rubeš, Němcová, and Erben. The term of Biedermeier has been adopted by Czech scholarship to designate the literature of that period, and to authenticate the non-Romantic nature of its production. As a crucial piece of evidence for the thesis of this article, the concept of Biedermeier relates the general tenor of Czech literary culture with the philosophical character of the Enlightenment and the detestation of Baroque *Schwärmerei*, thus illuminating

the stark contrast between the Máchá phenomenon and the entrenched Czech mentality. The concept of Biedermeier had been pioneered by Jiráť by analogy with the visual arts to characterize the period of Czech literature in the period from the 1820s to the 1840s.⁷¹ In advancing his concept of Biedermeier, Jiráť contrasted Máchá, as a singular representative of Romantic subjectivism yearning for turbulent freedom and unbound emotion, with his Realist contemporaries, exemplified particularly by Erben, who embraced literary Biedermeier, that is, the non-revolutionary classicist values of order, lawfulness and harmony.⁷² Jiráť further defined the *weltanschauung* of Czech Biedermeier as Christian Epicureanism, which finds the supreme happiness in peace and tranquility based on civic order and immaculate morality.⁷³ Jiráť maintained that it was only Máchá, who transcended the Bohemian Biedermeier and realized its antithesis. His Romanticism, unique in Bohemia, allied him with the literary movement of Young Germany.⁷⁴ About the same time that Jiráť pioneered the term for Czech literature, Andre Novák made a passing reference to Biedermeier as Atimid burgher Romanticism without applying the term either to an era or a group in Czech literature in his *Přehledné dějiny literatury české* [A Survey History of Czech Literature] (1936–1939).⁷⁵ The designation is not found in either of the two older standard surveys of Czech literature by Vlček and Jan Jakubec.⁷⁶

More recently the American scholar of comparative literature, Virgil Nemoianu, has stated: The literary atmosphere of the 1830s and 1840s in Bohemia could not be thoroughly understood without the concept of Biedermeier. The main figures of the period certainly displayed Biedermeier features...⁷⁷ He speaks of the defeat of Romanticism by

⁶⁶ Virgil Nemoianu, *The Taming of Romanticism: European Literature and the Age of Biedermeier* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984), 128; Nemoianu, *Ostmitteleuropäisches Biedermeier: Versuch einer Periodisierung, 1780–1850*, in *Die Österreichische Literatur: ihr Profil im 19. Jahrhundert, 1830–1880*, ed. Herbert Zeman (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1982), 127; Josef Haubelt, *České osvícenství*. 2nd ed. rev. (Prague: Rodiče, 2004); 1st ed. (Prague: Svoboda, 1986), 563.

⁶⁷ Vladimír Macura, *Znamení zrodu: České národní obrození jako kulturní typ*. Rev. ed. (Prague: H & H, 1995), 13. Recently, penetration of Romanticism onto the Bohemian literary scene in the 1830s was noted by Aleš Haman, *Nástin dějin české literární kritiky* (Jinočany: H & H, 2000), 25; the focus is, however, mainly on Máchá with references to Václav B. Nebeský and Karel Sabina; *ibid.*, 29–31. Earlier Souček refers to Čelakovský as a Romanticist, see Stanislav Souček, *Příspěvek k poznání Erbenova básníka*, *Časopis matice moravské*, 39 (1916), 248.

⁶⁸ Robert Sak, *Rieger: Konzervativce nebo liberál?* (Prague: Academia, 2003), 29. For references to Jungmann and his Romantic school see also Arne Novák, *Josef Dobrovský a jeho předchůdci v českém literárním dějepisě*, in *Josef Dobrovský, 1753–1829: sborník statí k stému výročí smrti Josefa Dobrovského*, eds. Jiří Horák, Matyáš Murko and Miloš Weingart (Prague: Výbor I. Sjezdu slovanských filologů, 1929), e.g. 251.

⁶⁹ Vojtěch Jiráť, *O klasicismu, zvláště pak o klasicismu českém*, in *Jiráť, Portréty a studie* (Prague: Odeon, 1978), 12.

⁷⁰ Mukařovský, *Příklad poezie: K otázce trvalé platnosti Máchova díla*, 37.

⁷¹ Jiráť, *Úloha biedermeieru v českém národním obrození*, 548–551; see also Vojtěch Jiráť, *Erben čili majestát zákona* (Prague: Jaroslav Podroužek, 1944), 17–20.

⁷² Jiráť, *Erben čili majestát zákona*, 17.

⁷³ Jiráť, *Úloha biedermeieru v českém národním obrození*, 548–549.

⁷⁴ Jiráť, *Úloha biedermeieru v českém národním obrození*, 551; see also Stanislav Sahánek, *Biedermeier v německém písemnictví* (Bratislava: Universita Komenského, Filozofická fakulta, 1938), 26.

⁷⁵ Arne Novák, *Přehledné dějiny literatury české*. 4th ed. (Olomouc: Promberger, 1936–1939), 217; Jiráť, *Úloha biedermeieru v českém národním obrození*, 548–549; see also Jiráť, *Erben čili majestát zákona*, 17.

⁷⁶ Jaroslav Vlček, *Dějiny české literatury* 2 vols. (Praha: Československý spisovatel, 1951); Jan Jakubec, *Dějiny literatury české*, 2d ed., 2 vols. (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1929–1934).

the Biedermeier.⁷⁸ Biedermeier has been viewed as a continuation of Enlightenment rationalism and moderation,⁷⁹ and also an early form of literary Realism.⁸⁰

The current standard survey, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* (1998), has made clear that Biedermeier was fundamentally different from Romanticism in its conception of the author and the reader.⁸¹ The volume assigned Tyl and Rubeš unequivocally to Biedermeier, and Němcová and Erben with some qualification.⁸² Jungmann is characterized as a representative of Enlightenment classicism, and Havlíček as a perpetuator of the same tradition in his literary Realism.⁸³ Milan Exner saw the moderate realism of the Biedermeier of the 1825–1848 period extending in the writings of Herben, Rais, Holeček and Nováková into the Czech literature of the second half of the nineteenth century.⁸⁴ According to Tamás Berkes, the concept of Biedermeier can cover most of Czech belles lettres from the 1820s through the 1850s with the notable and conspicuous exception of Mácha's works, but including Čelakovský and Němcová, as well as a number of lesser-known poets.⁸⁵

As the ascendancy of Realism and Empiricism, inherited from the Austro-Bohemian Catholic Enlightenment, provides, on the negative side, an explanation for the rejection of Romanticism in Czech belles lettres, so it supplies B on the positive side – the reason for the prevalence of the Realistic Biedermeier. It contrasts with the dominance of Romanticism in the neighboring countries, like Slovakia,

Poland, and Russia, where metaphysical Idealism, rooted in an amalgam of Teutonic and Iberian mysticism, persisted.⁸⁶ Characteristically Austria, which has shared with Bohemia in the heritage of the Catholic Enlightenment, paralleled between 1820–1853 the Biedermeier of the Czech belles lettres.⁸⁷ Moreover, while originally the concept of Biedermeier was applied largely to Central Europe,⁸⁸ in the late twentieth-century this literary trend was identified broadly also in Western Europe, especially in Britain, where significantly the tradition of Empirical and Realistic philosophy was also characteristic.⁸⁹

Polish and Slovak Contrast

Contrary to the Czech attitudes, Mácha's work enjoyed a positive reception in those countries which had not experienced the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment or its equivalent with its emphatically Realistic world outlook.⁹⁰ As noted earlier, Polish literature was deeply saturated with Romanticism in the post-Napoleonic era, and it was largely from its side that Romanticism could affect the literary scene in Bohemia. Mácha was a case in point. Having learned Polish, he is said to have studied the new Romantic poets of Poland B especially Mickiewicz, Malczewski, and Juliusz Słowacki B with an almost religious fervor.⁹¹ It is therefore not surprising that Mácha's *Máj* received a favorable response in Poland. *Máj* was greeted with an enthusiastic review by Bielowski in *L'viv*.⁹² Other Polish critics may

⁷⁷ Nemoianu, *The Taming of Romanticism*, 130. See also Dalibor Tureček, ABiedermeier a současná literárněvědná bohemistika, *Biedermeier v českých zemích*, Sborník příspěvků z 23. ročníku symposia k problematice 19. Století, Plzeň, 6. – 8. března 2003, eds. Helena Lorenzová and Taťána Petrasová (Prague: KLP, 2004), 390–392; idem, ABiedermeier a současná literárněvědná bohemistika, *Česká literatura*, 51 (2003), 289–301; idem, ABiedermeier a české národní obrození, *Estetika*, 30, 2 (1993), 15–24; Milan Exner, ABiedermeier a syndrom rozpadu, *Estetika*, 32, 2 (1995), 15–23.

⁷⁸ Nemoianu, *The Taming of Romanticism*, 142; similarly on Biedermeier as a reaction against Romanticism, see Viktor Viktora, *K pramenům národní literatury* (Plzeň: Fraus, 2003), 221.

⁷⁹ On Biedermeier as a continuation of the Enlightenment rationalism and moderation, see Jiráť, *Erben čili majestát zákona*, 20; see also Miloš Havelka, Byl Herbart filosofem biedermeieru? Herbartův pokus o realistickou akceptaci rozduvenosti člověka a světa, *Biedermeier v českých zemích*, 25.

⁸⁰ Exner, ABiedermeier a syndrom rozpadu, 17.

⁸¹ Lehár, Stich, Janáčková, and Holý, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku*, 209.

⁸² Lehár, Stich, Janáčková, and Holý, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku*, 208, 237, 246. Němcová is also assigned to Biedermeier by Exner, ABiedermeier a syndrom rozpadu, 16–17.

⁸³ Lehár, Stich, Janáčková, and Holý, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku*, 211. The somewhat older *Panorama české literatury: Literární dějiny od počátků do současnosti*, Lubomír Michala and Eduard Petrů (Olomouc: Rubico, 1994), applied the quaint term of Pre-Romanticism to Jungmann, Čelakovský, Tyl and Erben, 99–107. Havlíček and Němcová are unequivocally assigned to Literary Realism; *ibid.*, 114–116. The designation of Romanticism was reserved for Mácha; *ibid.*, 110–112.

⁸⁴ Exner, Biedermeier a syndrom rozpadu, 18.

⁸⁵ František Sušil, Josef V. Kamarýt, Vacek Kamenický, Jan z Hvězdy and others; see Tamás Berkes, České obrození jako literární kánon, in *Česká literatura na konci tisíciletí*, Příspěvky z 2. kongresu světové literárněvědné bohemistiky, Prague 3. B 8. července 2000, 2 vols. (Prague: Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR, 2001), 1:120–122.

⁸⁶ David, Hegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia, 17–20.

⁸⁷ Vojtěch Jiráť, Úloha biedermeieru v českém národním obrození, 548–549; see also Stanislav Sahánek, *Biedermeier v německém písemnictví* (Bratislava: Universita Komenského, Filozofická fakulta, 1938), 26.

⁸⁸ For a reflection of this view see Viktora, *K pramenům národní literatury* 219; Paul Kluckhohn, Biedermeier als literarische Epochenbezeichnung, *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literatur*, 13 (1935), 37–43.

⁸⁹ Nemoianu, *The Taming of Romanticism*, 3–6, 17–18; Nemoianu, Is There an English Biedermeier? *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 6 (1979), 27–45; for an earlier more skeptical application to England, see Friedrich Brie, Literarisches Biedermeier in England, *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literatur*, 13 (1935), 161–162. See also Lenka Kusáková, Biedermeier a literatura, *Biedermeier v českých zemích*, 288–296.

⁹⁰ Zdeněk V. David, *Catholic Enlightenment and Lutheran Idealism: Shaping the Political Culture of Central Europe, 1773–1848* (Washington, D.C.: Wilson Center Press; and Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, forthcoming), chapter 10.

⁹¹ Wellek, Mácha and English Literature, 149. See also Heidenreich, *Vliv Mickiewiczův na českou literaturu předbřeznovou*, 81–127; Jan Menšík, AMalczewského "Marie" a Máchův "Máj", in *Sborník prací věnovaných Janu Máchalovi k sedmdesátým narozeninám*, eds. Jiří Horák and Miloslav Hýsek (Prague: Klub moderních filologů, 1925), 75–101; idem, Mickiewicz a Mácha, *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, 3 (1927–28), 29; 14 (1928–29), 29.

have been less effusive, such as Edmund Chojecki, but even he placed Mácha above other Czech poets.⁹³

The reception of Mácha was even more favorable in Slovakia.⁹⁴ As noted earlier, it is significant that Mácha's work found the closest parallel not in the work of another Czech poet, but in the poetry of Jan Kollár who was a Slovak. In his poetical collection *Básně* (1821), Kollár also transmitted German Romantic ideals from the Lutheran intellectual milieu at the University of Jena, where he had studied in 1817–1819.⁹⁵ Among the Slovak reviewing media, Mácha's poetry received the highest praise in the journal *Hronka*, which favored Romantic literature, including translations from Aleksandr Pushkin and Adam Mickiewicz.⁹⁶ It was no wonder that the editor of *Hronka*, Karol Kuzmány called attention as early as 1836 to the publication of Mácha's *Máj* as an outstanding work in the Romantic spirit and one of the best poems in the Czech language.⁹⁷ Subsequently, he denounced Chmelenský's critique of *Máj*.⁹⁸ He also stressed the appeal of Mácha's Romanticism to the Slovak intellectuals.⁹⁹ On the Czech side, Čelakovský, in turn, called Kuzmány a *slovácký halama* [a Slovak oaf] and a *hrubý pacholek* [an insolent miscreant] for his attacks on Chmelenský.¹⁰⁰ The Slovaks' positive reaction to Mácha's work and to his Romantic Idealism was in line with the major impact of Herder's and Hegel's metaphysics and Idealism on the Slovak Lutheran intellectuals.¹⁰¹ The poetry of Kuzmány, Ľudovít Štúr, Jozef L. Hurban, Viliam Pauliny-Tóth, and Samo B. Hroboň, was strongly influenced by Mácha's work.¹⁰² Karol Štúr, the lesser known brother of the famous Ľudovít, wrote his poetry in Mácha's spirit, and dedicated to his model an elegiac poem in 1837.¹⁰³ Ľudovít Štúr him-

self declared in his *magnum opus*, *Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft*, that in Bohemia in the arts, as well as in poetry, they cannot offer a single uniquely creative spirit but except for Mácha.¹⁰⁴

In 1842, as a sign of his devotion, Hurban, a leading Slovak intellectual and Štúr's associate, published a ballad of Mácha in his almanac *Nitra* with glowingly laudatory comments.¹⁰⁵ Writing ten years after Mácha's death, Hurban reminisced about the great resentment among his Slovak contemporaries against Mácha's Czech critics in 1836–1837. The Slovak students targeted Chmelenský, Tyl and especially Tomiček, whom they intended to confront in Prague for what they considered a disrespectful attitude toward Mácha and his work. In addition, Hurban excoriated Tyl for the portrait of Mácha in *ARozervanec* as unreal and entirely false in its suggestion that the Czech poet lacked any moral principles and hence was thoroughly decadent. Hurban boasted of his devotion to Mácha, claiming that had worn out two copies of *Máj* from constant use, having spent innumerable exciting hours immersed in the poet's thoughts. According to Hurban, if Mácha had lived longer he might have become the first world-class poet of the Czechs.¹⁰⁶ The Slovak Romantic writers in the 1840's continued to be attracted to Mácha's poetry, which this younger generation, as Samuel Šipko noted in 1847, considered as the highest achievement in Czech letters.¹⁰⁷ Pauliny dedicated a poem to Mácha's memory in 1845.¹⁰⁸ Jan Botto's poem *ASmrt Janošikova*, written by 1848 and published in 1862, was, according to Jaroslav Vlček, a virtual paraphrase of Mácha's *Máj*.¹⁰⁹ Pavol Dobšinský reminisced in 1875 that in the period 1846–1849 the young Slovak students of the Levoča

⁹² In *Gazeta lwowska*, 1836, no. 52, December 24, 1836; cited Vašák, *Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy*, 79–80.

⁹³ Writing in 1847, cited by Vašák, *Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy*, 244. On Chojecki's attitude see also Horák, K. H. Mácha v literaturách slovanských, 320–324. For a delayed Russian reaction to Mácha as one of the most gifted Czech poets; see Nikolai V. Gerbel', *Poezii slavian: Sbornik luchshikh poeticheskikh proizvedenii slavianskikh narodov* (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia Akademiia nauk, 1871), 367. Among the South Slavs, an early translator of Mácha (1836–1837) was the Croatian poet, Petar Preradović; Pavel Vašák, *První překlad Máchova díla, Česká literatura*, 27 (1980), 598.

⁹⁴ Eduard Gombala, *Recepcia diela Karla H. Máchy a jeho romantická iniciatíva na Slovensku, Slovenská literatúra*, 34 (1987), 13–29; Kraus, Na tému Karel H. Mácha a Slováci, 63–70; Rudo Brtáň, *Ohlas Máchova Mája na Slovensku, Panoráma*, 14 (1936), 88; M. Pišút, *Karel Hynek Mácha a Slovensko, Elán*, 6 n. 8 (1935–1936).

⁹⁵ Pohorský, *Mácha a český romantismus v evropských souvislostech*, 2:381; Vodička, *Cesty a cíle obrozenecké literatury*, 155–163.

⁹⁶ Peter Káša, *Český romantismus očami J. M. Hurbana a L. Štúra*, in *Česká literatura na konci tisíciletí*, 1:153–154.

⁹⁷ Kuzmány, Karol, *Literní Zprávy, Hronka*, 1, pt. 3 (1836), 93. See also Kuzmány's elegy on Mácha: Karol Kuzmány, *Pláč nad smrtí Karla Hynka Máchy, Květy*, Příloha 16, December 29, 1836.

⁹⁸ Karol Kuzmány, *Slovo k panu Dr. Jos. Chmelenskému, Hronka*, 2, pt. 1 (1837), 88–90.

⁹⁹ Kuzmány, Ladislav, 57–58.

¹⁰⁰ Vašák, *Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy*, 92–93, 96.

¹⁰¹ Elena Várossová, *Hegelovské inšpirácie u Štúra a Hurbana*, in Várossová, *Filozofia vo svete: svet filozofie u nás* (Bratislava: Veda, 2005), 161–180; Rudolf Dupkala, *Štúrovci a Hegel: k problematike slovenského hegelianizmu a antihegelianizmu*, 2nd ed. (Prešov: Manacon, 2000), 19–23, 39–45; Robert B. Pynsent, B., *Slávy Herder*, in idem, *Ďáblové, ženy a národ: Výbor z úvah o české literatuře* (Prague: Karolinum, 2008), 91–104.

¹⁰² Ant. Procházka, *Máchův Máj a Bottova Smrt Janošikova*, sb. *Slovenská miscellanea* (Bratislava, 1931), p. 94; F. Frýdecký, *O vlivu Máchova Máje na Bottovu Smrt Janošikovu, Česká revue*, 9 (1915–16), 541; Vlček, *Dějiny české literatury*, 2:520; Macura, *Znamení zrodu: České národní obrození jako kulturní typ*, 202.

¹⁰³ Karol D. Štúr, *Pouť mladého pěvce: založpěv památce Karla Hynka Máchy, Květy*, Příloha 18, September 7, 1837, 69–70; Eduard Gombala, Karol Štúr a Karol Hynek Mácha, *Slovenská literatúra*, 24 (1977), 585–595.

¹⁰⁴ Ľudovít Štúr, *Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft*, ed. Josef Jirásek (Bratislava: Učená společnost Šafaříkova, 1931), 203.

¹⁰⁵ Jozef Miloslav Hurban, *Piseň od K. H. Máchy, Nitra*, 1 (1842), 153–154; see also Káša, *Český romantismus očami J. M. Hurbana a L. Štúra*, 1:157.

¹⁰⁶ Jozef Miloslav Hurban, *Prehľad časopisou a novin, Slovenskije pohľadi na vedi, umeňja a literature*, 1, pt. 2 (1847), 74–75. See also Káša, *Český romantismus' očami J. M. Hurbana a L. Štúra*, in *Česká literatura na konci tisíciletí*, 1:162.

¹⁰⁷ In *Považie* 10 (1847), cited by Kraus, *ANa tému Karel H. Mácha a Slováci*, 70.

¹⁰⁸ Vašák, *Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy*, 178–179.

¹⁰⁹ Antonín Procházka, *Máchův Máj a Bottova Smrt Janošikova*, sb. *Slovenská miscellanea* (Bratislava: Universum, 1931), 94; Fr. Frýdecký, *O vlivu Máchova Máje na Bottovu Smrt Janošikovu, Česká revue*, 9 (1915–16), 541–551.

region viewed Máchá as the sole authentically poetic spirit among the Czech authors, and sought to imitate his writing style.¹¹⁰

The Slovak intellectuals' interest in Máchá's poetry, paralleled their sympathy for the rare Czech Hegelians, evident particularly in Štúr's relationship with Matouš Klácel.¹¹¹ Palacký perceived the link between the Romanticism of Máchá and that of the Slovak followers of Kollár and Štúr, when in 1838 he deplored the Lučatínská Víla of Kuzmány as a work with the same pretensions of poetic style...which we viewed with distaste in Máchá.¹¹²

The Poet as a Philosophical Outsider

Máchá's poetry managed to combine two strands that were contrary to the mainstream of Bohemia's literary culture that derived from the realism of the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment and, more remotely, echoed the realism of the sixteenth-century Utraquists.¹¹³ One was the Herderian and Hegelian Idealist strand that emanated from the Polish Romanticism; the other was the Baroque pathos reminiscent of the literature of the Counter Reformation.¹¹⁴

The rejection of Máchá's Romanticism in Bohemia represented a parallel in literature to the almost concurrent rejection of Hegelian Idealism of Augustin Smetana, Matouš Klácel, and Ignác J. Hanuš in philosophy.¹¹⁵ It is significant that, while Máchá imbibed his ideas from Polish Romanticism, Hanuš, for instance, developed his penchant for Hegelianism in the Polish philosophical milieu of Galician L'viv.¹¹⁶ The reaction against both literary Romanticism and philosophical Idealism, both expressed the strength of the ontological and epistemological realism in the Bohemian intellectual milieu at the same time.¹¹⁷ The Catholic Enlightenment, originating in the latter part of the eighteenth century, persisted in its influence on the intel-

lectual life of Bohemia into the following century. First, it was mainly through the champions of Josephist Reform Catholicism, Bolzano, Fesl and František Příhonský; then by kindred Realistic philosophies, especially the thought of Johann Herbart. The latter, which the magisterial authority of Franz Exner implanted in Bohemia, dovetailed with the tenor of Bolzano's logical realism. Herbart's influence on the flourishing of Biedermeier in Czech literature did not consist only in thwarting tendencies toward Romanticism, but more positively also in engendering the ethical and pedagogical tenor within belles lettres. Thus Biedermeier reflected the force of Herbart's influence particularly in the conspicuous faith in the power of education that was characteristic of the tradition of the *Bildungsroman* in Austria, and mutatis mutandis also in Bohemia.¹¹⁸ Finally, the strength of the outlook, stemming from the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment, is further indicated by its persistence in the intellectual life of Bohemia also into the second half of the nineteenth century.¹¹⁹

Thus, it seems obvious that Máchá's devotion to Polish-style Romanticism and harkening after the mystique of the Counter Reformation clashed with the Czech sobriety and realism of the Catholic Enlightenment, a legacy reinforced by the earlier tradition of the Utraquist mainstream of the Bohemian Reformation. What caused resentment in Bohemia assured Máchá a favorable reception in areas under the sway of German Romanticism and philosophical Idealism, especially in Poland and in Slovakia, and attests to the presence of two philosophical traditions in east-central Europe. Thus, the case of Máchá can also serve as a prism through which to distinguish the two cultures of east-central Europe in the early nineteenth century.

¹¹⁰ Pavol E. Dobšinský in Janko Čajak, *Básne*, Dobšinský, ed. (Martin: Kníhtlačiarsko-účastinársky spolok, 1875), 114.

¹¹¹ L'udovít Štúr, *Listy*, ed. Jozef Ambruš and Vladimír Matula, 4 vols. (Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1954–1999), 2:185–188, 449–450.

¹¹² In his article on Vesna in *Časopis českého musea* (1838), cited by Souček, Příspěvek k poznání Erbenova básníka, 258, n. 1. B There is an anonymous article, ANové knihy české, *Časopis českého musea* (1838), 129–130, that reviews *Vesna*, including Kuzmány's Lučatínská Víla. I could not, however, find the reference to Máchá.

¹¹³ See note 4 in this article.

¹¹⁴ Moreover, Máchá's case illustrates the great paradox of Czech literature; namely, that some of its highest esthetic attainments were atypical of Bohemia's intellectual ambiance, whether it was the poetry of Máchá with his sentimental Romanticism, or that of Březina with his symbolist mysticism. On Máchá's relationship to Březina, see Arne Novák, O tradici v české literatuře, in Novák *Nosiči pochodní; kniha české tradice* (Prague, Literární odbor Umělecké besedy a Kruh českých spisovatelů, 1928), 26; František X. Šalda, Vývoj a integrace v poesii Otakara Březiny, in Šalda, *Duše a dílo: podobizny a medailony*, Soubor díla 2 (Prague: Melantrich, 1950), 131–132.

¹¹⁵ For this parallel in a somewhat different context, see also Gustav Zába, Filosofie, in *Památník na oslavu padesátiletého panovníckého jubilea Františka Josefa I: vědecký a umělecký rozvoj v národě českém* (Prague: Česká akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění, 1898), separate pagination, 3. See also David, *AHegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia*, 14–30.

¹¹⁶ *Slovník českých filozofů*, ed., Jiří Gabriel (Brno: Masarykova Univerzita, 1998), 158.

¹¹⁷ The sixteenth-century legacy was rediscovered and transmitted by the Enlightenment; see n. 2 in this article.

¹¹⁸ Sahánek, *Biedermeier v německém písemnictví*, 19–20; Miloš Havelka, Byl Herbart filosofem biedermeieru? Herbartův pokus o realistickou akceptaci rozvojenosti člověka a světa, *Biedermeier v českých zemích*, eds. Helena Lorenzová and Taťána Petrasová (Prague: KLP, 2004), 36–37.

¹¹⁹ For the rest of the nineteenth century, Bohemian academia participated in the Realism and Empiricism of the so-called Austrian philosophical tradition, which gained ascendancy in the Czech University of Prague with Josef Durdík, Thomas G. Masaryk, and Otakar Hostinský, and in the German one with Ernest Mach, Anton Marty and Carl Stumpf. This realistic and empirical tradition contrasted with the Idealism and metaphysical orientation, or the German philosophical tradition, in much of the other German-speaking area. On the two philosophical traditions, see, especially, Barry Smith, *Austrian Philosophy: The Legacy of Brentano* (Chicago: Open Court, 1994), 1. See also Jacques Le Rider, *Modernity and crises of identity: culture and society in fin-de-siècle Vienna*, trans. Rosemary Morris. (New York: Continuum, 1993), 11–12; David, *Hegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia*, 22–23.

Filozofická výzva Karla H. Máchy katolickému osvícenství v Čechách

Zdeněk V. David

České shrnutí

Česká averze vůči romantizmu v literatuře ve dvacátých až čtyřicátých letech devatenáctého století propukla v záporné reakci proti dílu Karla Hynka Máchy na straně tehdejšího literárního a intelektuálního establishmentu, zejména Josefa Kajetána Tyla, Františka L. Čelakovského, Josefa A. Chmelenského, Jana S. Tomička, Václava S. Štulce a Františka Rubeše. Tato studie má za účel nově osvětlit tuto grandiózní kulturní kolizi ustanovením spojitosti mezi vehementní kritikou Máchova díla na jedné straně a světovým názorem, který vyvstal z rakousko-českého osvícenství na straně druhé. Vztah mezi realistickým náhledem na svět a josefinským osvícenstvím nebyl jen nahodilý či neurčitý, ale hluboko zakořeněný v českém, jakož i v rakouském, duchovním prostředí.

Význačným rysem rakousko-českého osvícenství – hned z počátku za Marie Terezie – bylo rozhodné zavržení esencialistické barokní scholastiky protireformační a upřednostnění existencialismu Tomáše Akvinského. Přejít provedli duchovní zakladatelé josefinského reformního katolicismu, kteří preferovali realistu Akvinského proti metafyzikovi Francisku Suárezovi. Z tohoto hlediska, kulturní revoluce započatá Marií Terezií a dovršená Josefem II. rovněž rozhodně zavrhovala barokní emocionálnost a mystiku, které filozoficky pramenily z tak zvané druhé scholastiky a vrcholila v Suárezovi. Navíc proti-esencialistický postoj a ontický pluralismus josefinského osvícenství, jakož i averze vůči citovosti a monistické epistemologii protireformační, setrvaly v českém intelektuálním prostředí do polovice devatenáctého století pod dominantním pedagogickým vlivem Bernarda Bolzana (1781–1848) a Franze Exnera (1802–1853). Konečně, pokud se týká specificky české kulturní oblasti, filozofie josefinského osvícenství byla v souladu s realizmem Zlatého věku šestnáctého století. Jak jsem poukázal jinde, toto české myšlenkové dědictví bylo znovu nalezeno v počátcích národního obrození a jeho vliv posílil účinek osvícenství.

Máchovo vystoupení bylo mocnou výzvou existujícímu českému světonázoru ve dvou ohledech. V první řadě zášť proti Máchově intelektuální orientaci odhalila rozpor mezi filozofickým idealismem a monistickou metafyzikou romantismu na jedné straně a realistickým empirismem a ontickým individualismem rakousko-českého osvícenství na straně druhé. V druhé řadě odpor vůči Máchovu literárnímu stylu pramenil z jeho využití prvků barokní mentality (vizionářské, vášnivé a iracionální), která se střetla se střízlivostí, klidem a racionalismem pramenících rovněž z ducha josefinského osvícenství. Paradoxně tyto dvě Máchovy tendence, kterým se dostalo tak důrazného odsouzení v české literární kritice, směřovaly na opačné strany. Jedna, kterou možno nazvat inovační, mířila časově dopředu za česko-rakouské osvícenství k luteránsky inspirovanému německému romantismu a idealismu. Druhá, kterou je možno nazvat retrospektivní směřovala nazpět k barokní kultuře protireformační, kterou se katolické josefinské osvícenství snažilo překonat. Navíc tato „retrospektivní“ tendence zrcadlila střet dvou

verzí katolicismu: josefinského liberálního a tridentského protireformačního.

Na první pohled by se mohlo zdát paradoxním, že Mácha spojoval vlivy romantismu vycházejícího z německého protestantského prostředí s vlivy protireformačními, které vznikaly ve španělské scholastické tradici. Tento zdánlivý rozpor lze vysvětlit tím, že existovala nejen formální, ale i kauzální příbuznost mezi barokní či pozdní scholastikou s jejím „esencialismem“ na jedné straně a německým metafyzickým idealismem na straně druhé. Zatímco panovala ve školství tridentského katolicismu, pozdní scholastika zároveň ovlivňovala protestantský univerzitní svět v raném novověku. Zejména Christian Wolff vysoce oceňoval Suáreza a Hegel se o něm též vyjadřoval příznivě. Lze dokonce tvrdit, že Hegel se stal dědicem Suárezova metafyzického antirealismu a ontického antiindividualismu. V pozdním šestnáctém století se představitelé druhé scholastiky, především Pedro Fonseca, Benito Pereira a Suárez, stali standardními filozofickými autoritami na německých protestantských univerzitách.

Hlavním prostředníkem mezi metafyzikou španělské pozdní scholastiky a metafyzikou německého idealismu byl Wolff, jehož pojem „bytí“ byl podstatně totožný s termínem Suárezovým „kterého nejen četl, ale i analyzoval a kterého považoval za nejhlubšího mezi scholastickými metafyziky“ (Étienne Gilson, *Bytí a někteří filosofové*. Praha: Oikoyomenh, 1997, s. 141–42). Výsledně – třebaže proti intuitivní – ibero-jezuitské a luteránsko-teutonské křížové oplodňování (filozofické a teologické) nabízí podat obraz Máchovy mentality v novém světle. Od Wolffa esencialistická filozofie vstoupila do německého idealismu přes Kanta, který považoval přízemního Wolffa za nejdokonalejšího metafyzika a – překvapivě – za filozofa převyšujícího Spinozu, Leibnize, či Descarta.

Odmítání Máchova romantismu v Čechách představovalo v literatuře paralelu téměř současného zavržení ve filozofii hegelovského idealismu Augustina Smetany, Matouše Klácela a Ignáce Hanuše. Je příznačné, že – zatímco Mácha čerpal inspiraci z polského romantismu – na příklad u Hanuše se též zájem o hegelianství vyvinul v polském filozofickém prostředí haličského Lvova. Reakce proti jak literárnímu romantismu, tak i filozofickému idealismu, pramenila ze síly ontického a epistemologického realismu v tehdejší českém intelektuálním prostředí. Josefinské katolické osvícenství, které vzniklo v druhé polovině osmnáctého století, prodlužovalo svůj vliv na duchovní život Čech do následujícího století. Zprvu se tak stalo díky zastáncům josefinského reformního katolicismu, zejména Bolzana, Fesla a Františka Příhonského, jejichž učení dodatečně posílila realistická filozofie Johanna Herbarta. Herbarta, jehož ontická orientace souzněla s Bolzanovým logickým realismem, uvedl do Čech autoritativní univerzitní pedagog Franz Exner. Herbartova zásluha o rozkvět biedermeirovského směru v české literatuře spočíval nejen v odporu proti tendencím k šíření romantismu, ale v kladném smyslu též v podpoře etického a pedagogického smyslu v krásné literatuře. Tudiž biedermeier zrcadlil sílu Herbartova vlivu zvláště ve výrazné víře v prospěch výchovy a vzdělání, které charakterizovaly tradici *Bildungsromanu* v Rakousku a mutatis mutandis rovněž v Čechách. Konečně

setrvačnou sílu realistického světového názoru, který vycházel z rakousko-českého osvícenství, potvrdilo i jeho pokračování během druhé poloviny devatenáctého století, kdy dosáhl zakořenění na obou pražských univerzitách.

Je tedy zřejmé, že Máchova oddanost romantismu polského stylu a jeho žíznění po protireformační mystice kolidovaly s českou střízlivostí a s realismem rakousko-českého katolického osvícenství, jehož dědictví v českém případě umocnila dřívější tradice umírněné církve podobojí

za české reformace. Co způsobilo pohoršení v Čechách, zajistilo Máchovi příznivé přijetí v oblastech pod nadvládou německého romantismu a filozofického idealismu, zejména v Polsku a na Slovensku. Totéž dosvědčuje existenci dvou filozofických tradic ve středo-východní Evropě. Máchův případ může tedy sloužit za prizmat, přes který lze rozlišit dva myšlenkové a kulturní směry ve středo-východní Evropě v době raného devatenáctého století.